

## REMARKS

### Claim Objection

Claim 38 is objected to because of the informalities with respect to a term “from” misspelled as “form.” Claim 38 has been amended to correct the typographical error. The applicant respectfully submits that this amendment after final should be admitted under 37 CFR § 1.116 (b)(1) and (2).

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 (Anticipation)

The final Office action made a new rejection of claims 1-7, 10, 21-24, 26, and 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by a newly cited reference U.S. 5,766,076 to Pease et al. (the “Pease” reference). The three independent claims 1, 21, and 34 have been amended to require the output data that are stored in “the second database” (claim 1) or stored “apart from the first database” (claims 21 and 34) be removed after the output data are transmitted to the first database. These amendments are supported by, for example, paragraph 58 as originally filed, which says, in relevant part:

At regular time intervals, the poller function of the data mover in unit 40 moves the data from tables L-TICKET, L-PLAYER, L-SMD and L-JP in database 46 to corresponding tables RT-TICKET, RT-PLAYER, RT-SMD and RT-JP in database 24 through interface 48 and subnetwork 18. Moved data from tables L-TICKET, L-PLAYER, L-SMD and L-JP then are erased from database 46.

¶ 58, pages 26-27; see also, ¶¶ 51-56.

The amendments to claims 1, 21, and 34 were not presented earlier because they are made to overcome the new rejections made in the final Office action that are based on newly cited references. The applicant respectfully submits that the amendments put all pending claims in condition for allowance over the prior art of record, and therefore, the amendments should be admitted under 37 CFR § 1.116(b)(3).

Each of the independent claims 1, 21, and 34 now requires that the apparatus or method of the present application removes output data from a local database after they have been transmitted to a central database. One of the features of the claimed embodiments of the present application is that all input data needed by the one or more of the gaming machines are processed and generated by the central database. The local data processing unit comprising the local database stores input data obtained from the central database, but do not generate or provide input data directly from the output data temporarily stored in it.

The Pease reference does not describe or suggests such an apparatus or method. The Pease reference teaches that the gateway processor 138 maintains a current database of gaming machines. It does not teach or suggest that output data polled by the gateway processor 138 from gaming machines and stored in the database are removed from the database after the data are transmitted to the central system 106.

Therefore, the claimed subject matter of claim 1, 21, or 34 of the present application is novel and different from the Pease reference.

U.S. 6,682,421 to Rowe et al. (the "Rowe" reference) and the several other references made of record (which include U.S. 5,851,149 to Xidos et al., U.S. 6,275,867 to Bendert et al., and U.S. 5,885,158 to Torango et al.) do not teach or suggest this missing element either. Therefore, claims 1, 21, or 34 are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record at least for this reason, and are allowable as amended.

Claims 2-7, 10, 22-24, and 35-38 are dependent from claim 1, 21, or 34, and are thus allowable over the prior art of record at least for the same reasons as for claim 1, 21 or 34.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 (Obviousness)**

Claims 8, 9, 25, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Pease reference in view of the Rowe reference.

Claims 8, 9, 25, and 39 depend on claim 1, 21, or 34. As discussed above, the Pease reference, the Rowe reference, and the other references of record do not teach each and every limitation of claim 1, 21 or 34, either alone or combined together, and thus, claims 1, 21, and 34 are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, claims 8, 9, 25 and 39 are allowable at least for the same reason as for claims 1, 21, and 34.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 1-10, 21-26 and 34-39. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

No fee is believed to be due, but the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,  
**McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.**

Date: July 11, 2007



Yufeng Ma  
Reg. No. 56,975

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison Street, 34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
(312) 775-8000 (telephone)  
(312) 775-8100 (Facsimile)